

**To:** Hoppe, Michael[Hoppe.Michael@epa.gov]; Vaughn, Stephanie[Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov]  
**From:** Stan Kaczmarek  
**Sent:** Thur 9/12/2013 6:21:23 PM  
**Subject:** RE: RE: RE: Water data for website

There is no target for COPC data in water. CPG was only required to monitor and report the COPC data. The only water quality target CPG has regards turbidity.

It is very hard to state that one data point is outside the expected normal variability. When the results are coming in right around the method detection limit as it is for TCDD, the difference between 1.1 and 2.7 pg/l (as in parts per quadrillion) may not even be real.

I will go ahead and publish this, but let me know if it generates questions that I can help address.

**Stan Kaczmarek, PE**  
**de maximis, inc.**  
**186 Center Street, Suite 290**  
**Clinton, NJ 08809**  
**(O) (908) 735-9315**  
**(C) (973) 978-9621**

>>> On 9/12/2013 at 2:10 PM, in message  
<788e412d3ee24672a8102a66b689ff00@BY2PR09MB062.namprd09.prod.outlook.com>,  
"Hoppe, Michael" <Hoppe.Michael@epa.gov> wrote:

Stan,

The only concern for the water quality statement and correspondence is regarding the following:

CSW-2	8/5/2013	2.7	2,3,7,8-TCDD pg/L
-------	----------	-----	-------------------

The pre-dredge numbers max'd at 1.1 and this is more than twice the pre-dredge numbers.

***Operations did not adversely affect water quality.***

So the statement is generally true, but the argument can be made that it might have for this instance. 8/5 was a dredge day, but general turbidity outside the curtain during dredge times was low. Pre-dredge 8/5 was slightly elevated.

I was looking through my plans and didn't find any reference or comparison to a standard or action level, so I don't know exactly the target number for TCDD. It is an 100x less than the drinking water standard, which really doesn't apply.

Go ahead and publish and if you could stear me towards the Plan that I need to look at for the water quality numbers, I'd appreaciate it. I am a bit slow today...

Mike

Michael Hoppe

Federal On-Scene Coordinator

USEPA Region 2

Response and Prevention Branch

Preparedness Section

Phone: (732) 906-6908 Fax: (732) 321-4425

Cell: (908) 420-4472



**From:** Stan Kaczmarek [mailto:StanK@demaximis.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 11, 2013 2:18 PM  
**To:** Vaughn, Stephanie  
**Cc:** Hoppe, Michael  
**Subject:** Fwd: RE: RE: Water data for website

Stephanie, look at the attached reports for the website. I am ready to post when you give the word.

And thanks for updating the Coast Guard on who is responsible for determining what is and isn't appropriate for opening the bridges.

**Stan Kaczmarek, PE**

de maximis, inc.

186 Center Street, Suite 290

Clinton, NJ 08809

(O) (908) 735-9315

(C) (973) 978-9621

>>> On 9/11/2013 at 2:06 PM, in message <792eca3d-5f5a-4fe8-bf88-

87c830d8a3e1@Molas.amr.ch2m.com>, <Jennifer.Wilkie@ch2m.com> wrote:

Stan,

Please find attached for your review the updated weekly air and water monitoring reports, which include EPA's requested changes (see email below). I also removed the word "baseline" in reference to the pre-dredge data. I'm around this afternoon if you would like any other refinements made to the docs before you send back to EPA.

Jen

**From:** Stan Kaczmarek [mailto:StanK@demaximis.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, September 11, 2013 10:56 AM

**To:** Wilkie, Jennifer/CHC

**Cc:** Foster, Gary/ATL; McCready, Roger/DAY

**Subject:** Fwd: RE: Water data for website

Jen,

This afternoon, let's discuss how to proceed based on these comments.

In the meantime can you work on modifying the water and air reports for the website, taking into account her suggestions?

**Stan Kaczmarek, PE**

de maximis, inc.

186 Center Street, Suite 290

Clinton, NJ 08809

(O) (908) 735-9315

(C) (973) 978-9621

>>> On 9/11/2013 at 11:45 AM, in message  
<1b16cfc019454419812d730149fb87c4@BL2PR09MB017.namprd09.prod.outlook.com>, "Vaughn,

Stephanie" <Vaughn.Stephannie@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Stan,

Here are my comments:

PAMP Plan modification – it is not appropriate at this point to modify the actual plan, as this was already approved. Any changes to the plan should be done as a field modification or separate memo (or something similar). That said, I don't think I can agree with most of the changes you are proposing.

First, the approved plan states that after review of the initial data, it is anticipated that the frequency of COPC sampling will be able to be reduced to 1 time per week. I'm not sure where once every 12 days came from, but this is too low of a frequency.

Second, the approved plan includes 2 to 6 days of increased monitoring frequency when the zone of 28+00 to 21+00 is reached. This increased sampling is based on the fact that there are higher COPC concentrations in this area, and thus we want to make sure that the higher concentrations do not lead to unacceptable air concentrations. This requirement cannot just be abandoned at this point, but I do think that only 2 days of increased monitoring frequency are needed. Since COPCs should be sampled once per week anyway, this is only 1 additional round of samples.

Finally, I am open to discussing decreasing the sampling frequency further during capping. But let's hold off on making a decision on that until we evaluate at least another round or two of results.

Water Quality Data – what if instead of saying that operations were conducted within acceptable water quality limits, we say "Operations did not adversely affect water quality." Then change the summary at the beginning to state:



Water quality monitoring for this project began on June xx to establish pre-dredging, baseline conditions. Dredging operations, which began on August 3, 2013, are being continuously monitored to ensure that water quality remains similar to the pre-dredging conditions that were determined. Results shown in this report should be compared to either the non-dredging periods (for turbidity) or the pre-dredging results (for the composite data). Note that there is natural variability in water quality, which is reflected in the data you see below. The sampling locations are shown on the map at the end of this report.

We can discuss the exact wording of this summary, but I think a bit more information here will help people better understand what they are looking at.

**PAMP Data** – for the air report, can you add the detection limits to the results, instead of just saying nd? This can be done either in the table or as a footnote to the table.

Thanks,

Stephanie

**From:** Stan Kaczmarek [<mailto:StanK@demaximis.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 10, 2013 8:12 PM  
**To:** Hoppe, Michael; Vaughn, Stephanie  
**Subject:** Water data for website

Mike and Stephanie,

What do you think of the attached water quality report for the website? It includes, as requested, a summary of the COPC data from the first week of dredging to be posted on the website.

Also, attached is proposed language to modify the air monitoring frequency during the remainder of dredging and capping. Look forward to your review of both.

**Stan Kaczmarek, PE**

de maximis, inc.

186 Center Street, Suite 290

Clinton, NJ 08809

(O) (908) 735-9315

(C) (973) 978-9621